



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,300	07/31/2003	Nicholas D. McKay JR.	HPA-18702/04	2627
25006	7590	02/14/2005		
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 48007-7021			EXAMINER JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL	
			ART UNIT 3726	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 02/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/631,300

Applicant(s)MCKAY ET AL. **Examiner**

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 3-9, and 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aalbers (US 2003/0039822 A1) in view of Naghi et al. (US 2001/0005915 A1).

Aalbers teaches an adhesive roller construction comprising: an elongated strip **12**, the elongated strip **12** having a backing layer **14** and adhesive layer **16** overlying one side of the backing layer **14**, the strip having a first end, a second end and two spaced apart sides, the strip **12** being wound from the first end to the second end into a tubular cylindrical roll, wherein the backing layer **14** comprises a compressible layer (paragraph [0082], “polypropylene backing **14**”). Although “polypropylene” could be made of foam, Aalbers does not specifically teach that the polypropylene is made of foam.

Naghi et al. teach a backing layer **4** made of foam (paragraph [0035]) used in a cleaning roller.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of Aalbers with a foam compressible layer, in light of the teachings of Naghi et al., in order to provide a suitable compressible material that can

Art Unit: 3726

conform to the desired shape of the surface to be treated. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have selected the claimed material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. See also *Ballas Liquidating Co. v Allied industries of Kansas, Inc.* (DC Kans) 205 USPQ 331.

Regarding claim 3, Aalbers/Naghi et al. teach the invention cited with the exception of the foam layer comprising a closed-cell foam layer. Official notice is taken that it was well known in the art, to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to have used a closed-cell foam layer, in order to provide a foam material that has the desired compressibility. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have selected the claimed material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. See also *Ballas Liquidating Co. v Allied industries of Kansas, Inc.* (DC Kans) 205 USPQ 331.

Regarding claim 4, note the release agent **18** in Aalbers.

Regarding claim 5, Aalbers does not specifically teach that the release agent comprises silicone. However, Official notice is taken that it was well known in the art, to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to have used a silicone release agent, in order to provide a release layer that can easily be separated from the adhesive layer.

Regarding claims 6-8, see Aalbers at paragraph [0052].

Regarding claim 9, note the perforation lines **38** in Aalbers.

Regarding claim 12, the backing layer of Aalbers comprises a non-woven electrostatic charge retaining material (paragraph [0082] “polypropylene”).

Regarding claim 13, Aalbers teaches polypropylene instead of polyethylene. At the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to have used polyethylene because applicant has not disclosed that polypropylene provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the polypropylene taught by Aalbers or the claimed polyethylene because either type of material perform the same function of providing a compressible backing layer equally well.

Regarding claim 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have selected the claimed material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. See also *Ballas Liquidating Co. v Allied industries of Kansas, Inc.* (DC Kans) 205 USPQ 331.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so

Art Unit: 3726

long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

5. In response to applicant's argument that Naghi et al. discloses a completely different type of cleaning device having a compressive roller with a plurality of hooks extending outwardly from the roller and has a driven motor, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). It is clear that both Aalbers and Naghi et al. teach compressible backing layers. It would have been obvious to replace the polypropylene backing layer of Aalbers with the foam backing layer of Naghi et al. because Naghi et al. suggests that the use of compressible materials could be "... a foam, or other compressible materials." (see paragraph [0035]).

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, lines 17-23 to page 7, lines 1-10, filed 12/30/04, with respect to the rejection of the claims 1, 4, 6-9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) of claims 1, 4, 6-9, and 12 have been withdrawn.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Interviews After Final

8. Applicant note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing) to clarify issues for appeal requiring only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number (571) 272-4530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 5:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 273-4530. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Marc Jimenez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

MJ
February 9, 2005